

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

E. H., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

META PLATFORMS, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. [23-cv-04784-WHO](#)

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
CONSOLIDATE**

Re: Dkt. No. 74

Defendant moves to consolidate this action with the claims asserted against in *In re Meta Pixel Healthcare Litigation*, Case No. 3:22-cv-03580-WHO (N.D. Cal.) (“*In re Meta*”). Dkt. No. 74. Plaintiffs in this action – who are not users of Meta’s Facebook platform – oppose, as do the Lead Plaintiffs in the *In re Meta* – who represent classes of Facebook users. *See* Dkt. Nos. 75, 76.

The motion to consolidate is DENIED.<sup>1</sup> Consolidation will not achieve significant efficiencies and could instead create complexities. This case is already related to *In re Meta* and with the cooperation of all counsel, I expect this case will benefit from the discovery being taken in *In re Meta* while it proceeds apace on its own track.<sup>2</sup>

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: August 30, 2024



William H. Orrick  
United States District Judge

<sup>1</sup> This motion is appropriate for resolution on the papers. The September 4, 2024 hearing is VACATED. *See* Civ. L. R. 7-1(b).

<sup>2</sup> To the extent counsel believe further efficiencies can be secured, *e.g.*, setting Case Management Conference or other deadlines consistently between the two cases, they should feel free to file stipulations or administrative motions to that effect.